

THE  
CASE

Of the ADMISSION of  
DISSENTERS  
TO THE

Holy Communion.

Before they Renounce their *Schism*.

---

By WILLIAM HIGDEN, D. D. *late Rector  
of St. Paul's Shadwell, and one of the Preben-  
daries of Canterbury.*

---

The Second Edition.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for Samuel Keble, at the Turk's-Head in Fleet-  
street. 1715.

46.  
12. 17.  
418.





---



---

T H E

# P R E F A C E.

**N**OTHING has surpriz'd the World more, except *Occasional Conformity* it self, than the Defences that have been made for it. Indeed, the Qualities that would suffer Men to undertake that Province, are not likely to enable them to defend any Cause with the greatest advantage: But, without bringing their Abilities in question, it must be confess'd, on the other hand, that how great soever those had been, they were not like to have succeeded much better here. It is not possible to write with Consistence, but upon Principles; and all the Wit and Learning in the World cannot reconcile Contradictions; and *Occasional Conformity* is nothing else: It is a Contradiction to all the Prin-

ciples of Church-Communion; and to all the Principles of the Separation too and which is yet worse, a perpetual Contradiction to it self.

For if the *Occasional Conformists* can separate from the Church of *England* upon the account of her *Worship* and *Ceremonies*; and yet upon occasion conform to that *Worship*, and those *Ceremonies*, for which they separate: If they can publish to the World, *That the Parts*

Rights of the  
Protestant Dis-  
senters, Part I.  
p. 12.

*of Worship in which they joyn with the Church, and Church-men, are those they do not condemn as Faults in the Church, or Mistakes in the Church-men, or Sins against Conscience in themselves; and yet when they occasionally conform for an Office, can joyn in all Parts of the Church's Worship; and submit to every Term of her Communion; and may communicate with her their whole Lives, without being requir'd. to joyn in one Part of Worship, or submit to one Term of Communion more than they have already done: If they can therefore dissent from those very Things with which they can with a good Conscience*

*The Preface.*

5

Conscience comply, and never be guilty of Schism; and comply with every Part of Worship, and every Term of that Communion from which they separate, and yet not be guilty of Insincerity: If they can tell us, that to offer to God *what they think less acceptable than something* p. 6. *else that is in their Power to perform,* would be to offer him an Affront instead of Homage, and that therefore, whilst they think their Way of Worship more acceptable to God, than that establish'd by Law, they must remain Dissenters; and yet whilst they remain so, can prevail with themselves upon any occasion to affront the great God of Heaven and Earth, by offering him that very Service which they think less acceptable, when it is in their Power to perform their own more acceptable Way of Worship? (offer it now to thy Governour, and see whether he will be pleas'd with thee, or accept thy Person, Mal. i. 8. ) If they can, by Cobwebs of Distinction, finer than ever were pun in the Schools, tell us *they can comply now and then with an Ecclesiastical* ib. p. 8. *Usurpation in Things indifferent,*

B

*with-*

*without complying with the Principles upon which that Usurpation is founded, and can separate from the Imposition of a*

P. 13. *Thing indifferent, when they do not separate from the indifferent Thing impos'd; tho' it is beyond my Skill to guess how this may be done without the assistance of the Jesuitical Doctrine of the Direction of the Intention: If they can tell*

*us, That constant receiving the Sacrament kneeling, would abet, and give countenance to the unlawful Action of imposing it, which the Occasional receiving of it in the same posture does not; tho' all Mankind, but themselves, would conclude, if that Action were unlawful, the only difference is, that the one abetted it constantly, and the other occasionally; or rather, since the Members of the Church look upon it as a lawful Action, by receiving constantly kneeling, they abet it with a good Conscience; and they abet it against Conscience, who esteem it an Ecclesiastical Encroachment, and yet occasionally receive in that posture: If, lastly, the Occasional Conformist can go from Schism to*  
*Schism*



## The Preface.

7

Schism, and, upon a good occasion, to the Church too, and thence immediately to their Schism again, and call this *Catholick Communion*; and in the mean time make the Members of the Church, because they go sometimes to a Cathedral as well as their Parish Church, or sometimes to their Parish Church *ib. p. 17.* in the Country, and sometimes in the City, *Occasional Conformists*, tho' they are all the while in the very same Communion and Church, and never *once* communicate with any Assembly with which they cannot *always* communicate: If the *Occasional Conformists*, and their *Champions*, are arriv'd at such a Mastery over their own Understandings, as to believe these Things, or over their Consciences, to publish it to the World if they do not; The Mistakes, or Influences they are under, seem to be too powerful for the force of *Reason*, and the conviction of *Argument*: It is therefore time to have done with these Gentlemen, and their Practice too, as far as they are concern'd in it, and to take a new View

*Moderation  
still a Virtue.  
P. 49. 50.*

of

of this Case on that side which has not been so much consider'd, *Whether the admission of such Persons to the Holy Communion can be justified, before they renounce their Schism?*

One would have thought this Question should never have come before the Clergy of the Church of *England*, and that their own pretended Spiritual Guides would have restrain'd them in so loose and scandalous a Practice: A Practice that tends directly to the Dissolution of that Discipline for which they have express'd so great a Zeal: For what Effect can the Refusal of *their* Sacrament have upon any of their offending Members, whilst themselves allow a Practice, whereby he may receive it as well in any other Communion, as their own?

But this is not all; one would have expected they should have condemn'd it upon the account of a very sensible *Scandal*, their own Ministers, I say, who have so often urged that Text against Conformity, *Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the Church of God*, 1 Cor. 10. 32. and have been so importunate in  
their

## The Preface.

9

their Charge of the Scandal and Offence, that is given to weak Consciences, by Conformity to the Orders of the Church, that besides Dr. *Hammond's* Tract of *Scandal*, there have been since publish'd no less than two entire Discourses more, to answer their Objections upon that Head, and to vindicate the Church, and the Conformity of its Members from that unjust Imputation. How comes it to pass then, that they who have been so loud in charging Scandal on the Conformity of the Members of the Church, have been so silent upon the Occasional Conformity of their own Members? For if by *Scandal* they understand the doing that which may be matter of grief to others, have not Dissenters much greater reason to be grieved, when they see their Fellow-Dissenters act against their own Principles, than when they see the Members of the Church act according to theirs? Or if by *Scandal* they understand, the doing that which may induce other Persons of weak Consciences to sin, by doing the same against their Judgments; Are not these weak Consciences in far greater danger of being carried to the commission of unlawful or suspected Actions, by the Example of Per-

*Some Considerations  
about the Case of Scan-  
dal, or giving offence  
to weak Brethren.*

*The Charge of Scan-  
dal, or giving offence  
by Conformity refell'd.  
Printed in the Lon-  
don Cases.*



sons of their own Perswasion, than by the Example of those from whom they differ? The different Principles of the one, fortifie them against the Contagion of the Example; whereas the common Principles of the other are apt to prove a Snare to them. What account then is to be given of this extraordinary, this partial Conduct? Are they at last convinced that there is no Sin, nor Scandal in Conforming to the Church? If so, how can they ever answer it to God; to the Church; to their own People, and to their own Consciences, that they keep up so sad and unreasonable a Separation? But if they still believe there is any Sin, and consequently Scandal in Conformity, why have they not *lifted up their Voice as a Trumpet, and shewn Jacob their Transgression, and Israel their Sin?* What is the reason, I say that they, who, heretofore made such a noise, with the Offence and Scandal of Conformity, have, since the Days of *Occasional Conformity*, been so profoundly silent on this Head? Is it because they like a *well-Officer'd* Congregation? Or since *Occasional Conformity* has been made a Step to Power, do they let it pass uncensured, upon the same Motive which an eminent Nonconformist made use of among others, to perswade the People to  
take



## The Preface.

II

take the Covenant? *Because Antichrist, and his Faction had prosper'd so much by entering into Covenants, therefore the People of God should try what this way will do, which has been so advantageous to the Enemy. For God, said he, may make use of that Stratagem to ruin their Kingdom, which they used to build it.*

Mr. Case's Sermons about the Covenant, p. 64.

But what account soever they are able to give of their Behaviour, I must confess, I am as much at a loss to guess at the reasons of those few Clergy-men (I hope they are but few) who are for admitting *Occasional Conformists* to the Holy Communion, and shall think my self very happy if this Discourse shall convince them of their mistake. The Method I have taken for the Resolution of this Case, is the most unexceptionable, and such, as I think they cannot fairly decline; for I have proceeded on such Principles as are founded on that Sense of the Holy Scriptures, which has descended to us by constant Tradition, supported by the Decrees of General Councils, and the Discipline of the Primitive Church, and the Laws and Discipline of our own Church. It is, I confess, a great satisfaction to me, and I hope will be to all the true Sons of the Church, to behold the Agreement betwixt the Primitive Church and our own, not only in the particular

Case.

Case now before us, the refusing of Communion to *Schismatics*, before they are reconciled to the Church, but also in those previous Principles on which the Resolution of this Case depends.

I have ever thought, since I understood any thing of these Matters, that to appeal to the Primitive Pattern in any disputed Point, was the securest and most honourable Vindication of our Church, and so all must think, who do not look upon themselves as the first Christians, or which is next to it, act as if they were. We know the Church of *Rome* charges the Church of *England* with *Novelty*, because she has cast off their *Innovations*; and the *Dissenters* with as much reason have traduced her for *Popish*, because she has retain'd what is *ancient*: Her Answer to both is, *Desinat incessere vetustatem novitas*, and with this Answer she'll always be able to maintain her ground.

To give one Instance for all, in the great controverted Question, of *Church-Government*; which has a near relation to the Case before us, for Church-Communion and Schism, in a great measure depend upon it. The *Episcopal Authority* has its Foundation in the Apostolical Office, and in the Holy Scriptures, and almost every Act of the Primitive Church proves it, and every

## The Preface.

13

Page of its History speaks it. But the *Papal Supremacy*, which is a Usurpation upon the Rights of the *Episcopal College*, and the *Presbyterian Party*, which is a Rebellion against it, have neither of them any Warrant from Scripture, nor the Primitive Ages but the Records of the ancient Church, are invincible Testimonies, and the whole History of its Government, one entire Precedent against both: And they who have talk't of late so much of *Catholick Communion* on one side, as well as those who write *Essays* towards it on the other, should consider how well this becomes them, whilst they abet those two great dividing Articles of *Christendom*, which are, To have in effect but *one Bishop*, or to have *no Bishop* in it.

An Appeal to Antiquity, I say, is always the best Defence of our Church, and shews us that its Government is the same, which the Primitive Church exercis'd, and if any thing more need be said to recommend it, To preserve this *Primitive Government*, is the best way to preserve the *Primitive Faith*. We are sensible what great Errors and Superstitions crept into the Church under the Shadow of the Papal Power; and we all know that the Frenzy of the last Age had no sooner outraged the sacred Order of Bishops,

D

but



Case now before us, the refusing of Communion to *Schismatics*, before they are reconciled to the Church, but also in those previous Principles on which the Resolution of this Case depends.

I have ever thought, since I understood any thing of these Matters, that to appeal to the Primitive Pattern in any disputed Point, was the securest and most honourable Vindication of our Church, and so all must think, who do not look upon themselves as the first Christians, or which is next to it, act as if they were. We know the Church of *Rome* charges the Church of *England* with *Novelty*, because she has cast off their *Innovations*; and the *Dissenters* with as much reason have traduced her for *Popish*, because she has retain'd what is *ancient*: Her Answer to both is, *Desinat incessere vetustatem novitas*, and with this Answer she'll always be able to maintain her ground.

To give one Instance for all, in the great controverted Question, of *Church-Government*; which has a near relation to the Case before us, for Church-Communion and Schism, in a great measure depend upon it. The *Episcopal Authority* has its Foundation in the Apostolical Office, and in the Holy Scriptures, and almost every Act of the Primitive Church proves it, and every



## The Preface.

13

Page of its History speaks it. But the *Papal Supremacy*, which is a Usurpation upon the Rights of the *Episcopal College*, and the *Presbyterian Party*, which is a Rebellion against it, have neither of them any Warrant from Scripture, nor the Primitive Ages but the Records of the ancient Church, are invincible Testimonies, and the whole History of its Government, one entire Precedent against both: And they who have talk't of late so much of *Catholick Communion* on one side, as well as those who write *Essays* towards it on the other, should consider how well this becomes them, whilst they abet those two great dividing Articles of *Christendom*, which are, To have in effect but *one Bishop*, or to have *no Bishop* in it.

An Appeal to Antiquity, I say, is always the best Defence of our Church, and shews us that its Government is the same, which the Primitive Church exercis'd, and if any thing more need be said to recommend it, To preserve this *Primitive Government*, is the best way to preserve the *Primitive Faith*. We are sensible what great Errors and Superstitions crept into the Church under the Shadow of the Papal Power; and we all know that the Frenzy of the last Age had no sooner outraged the sacred Order of Bishops,

D

but

but swarms of Sects, of monstrous Names, and more monstrous Tenents, like Locusts infested and overspread the Land.

And what is there on this side Heaven worth securing, (and 'tis the way to secure that too) if not that *Authority* which *Christ* established in his Church, and that *Faith* he taught it? 'Tis true, you'll say, if it were in danger. But where the Stake is of the last Importance, our utmost Endeavours, so as they are no more than lawful, are but sufficient to guard against its remotest Dangers: And yet, have we not seen an Episcopal Church fall before our Eyes, that a few Years since flourish'd with as fair Hopes as our selves? I mean the *Poor Church of Scotland*, over whose hard Fate I could shed Tears: *Poor Church!* She *bears the Voice of her Oppressors---* *but on her side is no Helper.* God give her Patience in the Day of her Adversity; she never shall want my Prayers: And was not the Fall of that very Church heretofore, a sad Prelude to the Ruin of our own? And do we not already see Men of the same Principles insult the Church's Outworks; evade those Laws which were made to secure Her? They tell us indeed, these are *friendly Approaches*, and they have not those ill Designs we apprehend; without doubt they would

would tell us of it, if they had ; and we are to believe every Word they say, and forget every Thing they have done.

It is not one of the least instructive Parts of History, to observe by what Degrees designing Parties arrive at Power ; how they never keep to their first Pretensions ; but when they have gain'd those, make use of them only as Steps to more extravagant Demands : whether it be, that their Hopes, and consequently their Designs, rise in proportion to their Success ; or that all such Parties have so much of *Sylla* in them, that having done some ill Things, they must defend them by doing greater ; or whether those Designs that were last in the Execution, were always with the Men of deep Thought, first in the Intention, but colour'd over with specious Pretences, and covertly introduced under more plausible Aims ; and not open'd to the less designing, and more innocent Men of their own Party, till the proper Season required it, and till they had so long implicitly follow'd their Measures, that they knew not how to retreat : Whatever the reason be, thus we see it is in the Event, and we need go no farther than our own Nation and History to be convinc'd of it.

When



When a prevailing Party had by Artifice and Violence obtruded on King *Charles* the I. to pass the Bill of Attainder against the Earl of *Strafford*, did they stop there? No, the next Step in that kind, was to destroy the Primate of the Church, by an *Ordinance of Parliament*, as they call'd it; and there remain'd but one Degree of Wickedness more, and to that in a little time they arriv'd, and murder'd their Sovereign, and the Monarchy too, by a *Vote*.

Numerous Instances might be given of that excellent Prince's Concessions, which had no other effect upon those Men, but to encourage them to more insolent Demands.

But to keep within the Sphere of Church Affairs. Did not the Men of these Principles, in the Dawning of their Power, shew some regard to the *Liturgy*, and to the *Government of the Church*, and except some few *Alterations* to be made in each, thought fit to appear resolv'd to preserve both; and to possess the Nation with this belief, made a solemn Declaration, which they caus'd to be printed and publish'd in all  
*April 9. 1642. Market-Towns, That they would take away nothing in the one, or the other, but what should be evil, and justly offensive, or at least unnecessary and burdensome.* Here is all Moderation, and it was



was necessary at that time, to gain the unwary and less designing Men, without whose assistance they could not succeed in their Attempts, in which they ever gradually advanced, as they rise in Power; these very Moderate Men, notwithstanding these specious Pretences, in two or three Years would be contented with nothing less than the entire Abolition of the *Liturgy*, and the Extirpation of *Episcopacy Root and Branch*.

I have call'd them *Men of their Principles*. The *Occasional Conformists* may say, many of them were Members of the Church. It must be confess'd they were *in* the Church, but according to St. *John's* Rule, they were not *of* it, who could so soon go out of it and destroy it. And if they who profess'd themselves her Sons, could conspire, or so easily fall in with the Measures of those who conspir'd her Ruin; Can she expect better from these *Occasional* Friends, but *Stated* Enemies? Has she any reason to believe they will sit down with their first Pretensions, and not make the same use of Concessions their Predecessors did, as so many Steps to more daring Attempts? No, she sees they will not. A Toleration was a very reasonable Request, in those *Dissenters* whose Consciences would not give them leave to conform, and it is to be hoped,  
E they

they are perfectly contented with it ; but the *Occasional Conformists* no sooner gain'd this advantage, but they make use of it to struggle for Power : And if this Point should be ever settled in their Favour, we need not doubt after such a Concession, they'll make use of it, to set on foot new Pretensions, tho' what those will be, Time only can discover. In the mean time, can we doubt but when they have opportunity, they'll use their Power as they have always done ? If we can doubt it, they themselves will undeceive us.

In the midst of their Caresses to the Church, in the soft Days of Moderation, one of their great Champions has dropt these remarkable Words, *A great many People mean something else by the safety of the Church, than the security of its Articles : And when they say, the admission of Dissenters into Offices, is inconsistent with it, they mean, 'tis inconsistent with the Preservation of those Tenets which are either no Part of the Articles, or less necessary, and perfectly accidental to Christianity and true Religion ; as the Divine Right of Episcopacy ; the absolute necessity of an uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles ; the Episcopal Form, together with the present Rites and Ceremonies, abstracted from its Doctrine and Discipline.---TO SAY*  
Rights of Protestant Dissenters, Part II. p. 33. *THE TRUTH, I DON'T KNOW BUT*  
*THE*

**THE ADMISSION OF DISSENTERS INTO OFFICES, MAY BE AN IMPROPER MEANS TO PRESERVE THESE MEN'S CHURCH.** These Words want no Comment; and if we can forget our Experience of what they have formerly done; if we can believe the same Effects will not follow from the same Causes; yet let us believe themselves: This single Confession is an Argument of ten times more force for the Bill, than all the Reasons he has employed against it. His Challenge to the Church of *England* may deserve our notice too. *Let her try, saith he, to find any* ib. p. 40. *Instance of the Dissenters endeavouring her Ruin, besides the lawful and open Attempts which they made upon all occasions, after a further Reformation of the Church.* We know well enough what they mean by a *further Reformation of the Church*, which has been their avowed and incessant Attempt from the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign, and therefore 'tis with some Art he restrains our enquiry to three Reigns only. But without entring on the History of those Reigns, doth he not think them accountable for what they have done in the rest? Or doth he tacitly condemn it? As the illegal Imposition of their illegal Covenants (the Standard of their Reformation) on the Clergy, and the Members of both Universities, against



gainst their Consciences and former Oaths; turning out several Thousands with their Families, to starve for refusing it; The pressing of the same on the rest of the Subjects under heavy Penalties; the abolishing of the Liturgy; the extirpation of Episcopacy; the sacrilegious Sale of the Church's Lands; the taking up Arms against their Sovereign, who espous'd the Church's Cause, &c. These were *open Attempts* indeed. Doth this Author think them lawful too? them, and the Principles on which they were carried on? If not, he deserts in a great measure, the Cause which he appears to defend. But if lawful, all I shall say to it, is, If they could do all those things, and yet do nothing but what they think *lawful*, what will become of this poor Church, if the *Dissenters* ever come to use *unlawful* Attempts against Her? I know but one thing beyond this, and that is, for the Members of the Church, to trust them with Power to do it.

Unhappy Church of *England*! If when her Enemies conspire her Ruin, her own Sons can deliberate whether she shall *yet* be safe.

----- *Qui prorogat horam,  
Rusticus expectat dum defluat annis, at ille  
Labitur, & labetur in omne volubilis ævum.*



---

---

*Whether the Dissenters from the Church  
of England, ought to be admitted to  
the Holy Communion before they  
renounce their Schism?*

Consider'd in an

A P P E A L

To the

Catholick Church, &c.

---

**I**N order to the Resolution of this Question, I  
shall endeavour to prove:

*First, That the Church is, by Divine Right,  
invested with a Power of Excommunication, or  
of denying Her Communion to Offenders in part, or  
entirely casting them out of it.*

*Secondly, That Schism is an Offence that deserves  
the Censures of the Church. And,*

*Thirdly, That if the Governours of the Church do  
not inflict it, yet the Church has, by several Canons, de-  
clared Schismatics to be in some cases, ipso facto,*

B

*excom-*

excommunicated; however, they always excommunicate themselves by their Schism, and thereby lose their Right to approach the Lord's Table, as well as they who are excommunicated by the Church.

*Fourthly, That they who are either way cut off from the Communion of their own Church, do stand excommunicate to all the Churches in the World.*

*Fifthly, That this is the Case of the Dissenters from the Church of England, who all lie under the guilt of Schism.*

After the Proof of these Five Propositions, this Question, which depends upon them, will soon be decided.

I begin with the First :

*That the Church is by Divine Right invested with a Power of Excommunication; or of denying Her Communion to Offenders in part, or entirely casting them out of it.*

The Church, as well as other Societies, hath a Power to admit Members into Her Communion, and to exclude 'em from it: Even the least Colleges, and meanest Corporations, by the Statutes and Charters of their Founders, enjoy this Power; without which, 'twere not possible to govern, or preserve themselves. But as the Church is endow'd with spiritual Privileges, and has a Divine Founder; so it is vested with this Power by a Divine Charter: A Power, *First*, To admit Persons into this Society by *Baptism*; and upon their demerits, to exclude them out of it by Her *Censures*.

And, *First*, for Her Power of admitting Members; by which, I mean, that She is entrusted not only with a Power of administering Baptism, the initiating Sacrament, that makes Men Members of the Church; but also with a Power of judging who  
are

are qualified for it by the Terms of the Gospel, without which it cannot be duly administred.

This Authority appears in the Commission our Lord gave his Apostles, *Go, teach or make Disciples of all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* They were first commanded to make them Disciples, then to Baptize, but only such as should submit to the Gospel. As they were to instruct them in the Conditions of this Covenant; Repentance from dead Works, Faith in Christ, and Obedience to the Laws of his Gospel, so they were to judge, whether their Profession of Repentance, of Faith, and Obedience, was such as the Gospel required, such as rendred them fit to be Members of the Invisible Church, to which they were entitled by their admission into the Visible. In short, they were to judge whether they understood and submitted to the Conditions of this Covenant, before they set God's Seal to it, before they conferr'd Baptism, which entitled them to all the Benefits of it.

Hence the Ancient Church made Canons, that:

(a) *Catechumens* should not be admitted to Baptism (a) Conc. Nic. Can. 2. before a competent time of Trial; (b) That in (b) Bals. Zonar. Arist. in Can. 5. Conc. Neocæs. some cases they should be a long time suspended from it. Hence also, it utterly denied Baptism to others, as the *Mimi, Scenici, &c.* unless they renounced those Arts that were inconsistent with Christianity. By the same Power our Church orders, when *Persons of riper Years are to be baptized*, See the Rubricks before the Ministration of Baptism, to such as are of riper Years. *due care is to be taken sometime before, for their Examination, whether they are sufficiently instructed in the Principles of the Christian Religion, &c. And if they are fit, then to be baptized:* Which implies, if they are not fit, they are to be denied Baptism till they are;



are; otherwise this Examination would be enjoind to no purpose.

I have chosen to exemplifie this Power of the Church in the admission of Adult Persons, in which it is more conspicuous; not but that it appears, even in the Baptism of Infants, whom She doth not admit without Sponsors, to stipulate in their Names, and to give Security to the Church, that they shall be educated in the Christian Faith, Communion, and Practice.

But the Church's Authority, both of admitting into Her Communion, by Baptism, all that are qualified for it; and of shutting out those who are not: farther appears in the *Donation of the Keys*, *Matth. 16. 19.* and *Matt. 18. 18.* compared with *Joh. 20. 23.* For whatever other Branches of Authority are comprehended in the Power of the *Keys*, and whatever other Remission of Sins may be here meant; it certainly includes the Power of receiving, by Baptism, into the Communion of the Church, and to all the Privileges of it, those Persons whom the Gouernours of this Society judge qualified for it; and of shutting out those who are not; or who, after their admission, cease to be so, by not performing the Conditions, on which they were admitted. And because all Sins are pardoned in Baptism, they who are received into the Church by it, have *their Sins remitted*; but they who are denied this admission, or who, after their admission, are for their demerits excluded out of this Society, to which alone the Promise of Remission of Sins is made, *their Sins are reteind.*

And, indeed, from the Authority of administering Baptism, the Power of Excommunication necessarily follows:



follows: For since the Governours of this Society are entrusted with the Power of judging what Persons are qualified to be Members of it, they are thereby impower'd, not only to refuse admission to those who are not; but also to exclude those they have receiv'd, if they perform not the Conditions upon which alone they were admitted. It has been therefore a vain Attempt in some Learned Men, to dispute the Church's Power of Excommunication, when they were not able to deny Her Power of Baptizing, nay, could not but own it, as particularly the Learned Mr. *Selden* doth; after which, to oppose Her Power of Excommunication, which that of Baptism plainly infers, is, I think, no better than to deny the Conclusion after they have yielded the Premisses. They are not, indeed, so much distinct Powers, as different Acts of the same Power, or the same Power exercised in a different manner, according as the Object is differently disposed: It is a Power to judge, who are qualified to be Members of this Society, and who are not; to refuse those who are not; to admit those who are, upon their solemn Stipulation, or Contract, to observe the Conditions of it; which, if they do, they are as certainly Members of the Invisible as of the Visible Church; and to exclude them afterwards from this Visible Communion, if they do not perform those Conditions on which they were at first admitted; because it may justly be presumed, that they have excluded themselves from the Kingdom of Heaven.

And as the Power of Excommunication is founded in that of Baptism, and expressly convey'd in the Donation of the *Keys* to the Officers of Christ's  
C Kingdom,

Kingdom, so we have the manifest Exercise of it in Apostolical Practice. St. Paul, 1 Cor. 5. commands the Church of *Corinth* to deliver the incestuous Person to Satan, ver. 5. to whose Power they were exposed, who were out of the Church's Communion; and that he was to be excommunicated or excluded out of the Christian Society, is evident from several Passages in that Chapter, particularly from the 4th and the 13th Verses, where the Apostle enjoins them, to put away from among them that wicked Person, when they were gathered together in the Name of our Lord Jesus; which was a formal Excommunication, and consequently cut him off from all the spiritual Privileges annexed to the Christian Society (even the Kingdom of Heaven) to which he was entitled by his Baptism. And therefore to say, Excommunication is only a Civil Outlawry, or Banishment, is in effect to say, that Baptism gives us a Title only to Civil Rights, or, which is equally false, that our Saviour's Kingdom is of this World. After this, I need not prove, that the lesser Degrees of this Power are lodg'd in the Officers of the Church, as the suspending of Offenders from the Lord's Table, &c. which are all included in the greater, and which are granted even by some of those Persons who deny the Church's Power of Excommunication, and can, I think, be justly denied by none, who own it.

Having asserted the Authority of the Church, to admit Persons into it by Baptism, and to cast them out of it by Excommunication, and both by *Divine Right*, I proceed in the Second Place, to consider what Offences render Men obnoxious to this last Censure, and these we shall find to be *Heresie*,  
*Schism*,

*Schism*, and other *notorious Sins*: These, at least, are the Principal to which the rest may be reduc'd; and that Men may be justly cast out of the Christian Society for every one of these, appears from the very Terms upon which they were received into it; from the Authority of the Scriptures; and from the Laws and Practice of the Primitive Church, as well as our own. And, *First*, for *Heresie*; What can be more reasonable than to exclude Men out of the Church for departing from that Faith, upon the Profession whereof they were admitted into it? It was for this, *St. Paul delivered Hymenæus and Alexander to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme.* And for *Schism*; since all Societies have a Power to preserve themselves, what can be more equitable than to expel Men, who endeavour to divide, *i. e.* to destroy a Society, whose Union they were obliged to preserve when they were received into it? to exclude them when they condemn the Authority of its Governours, which received them, and to which they became subject by the Laws of Christianity, upon the Profession of which they were at first admitted? And for this we have Divine Precept, *If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen Man, and a Publican.* And, *Lastly*, for notorious Sins; What can be more just, than to put Men out of the Christian Communion for those Sins, upon the renouncing of which, they were at first receiv'd into it? to exclude them for the open Violation of the Laws of the Gospel, since Obedience to those Laws, was one of the Conditions of their admission? And for this, we have an Apostolical Canon, *I have written unto you, saith St. Paul, not to keep company; if any Man that is* call'd

1 Tim. 1. 20.

Matth. 18. 17.

1 Cor. 5. 11.



*call'd a Brother, be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or an Idolater, or a Railer, or a Drunkard, or an Extortioner, with such a one, no, not to eat.* And agreeably, we find Excommunication decreed against all these sorts of Offenders, by the Synods of the Ancient Church, and of our own, as appears from several of their Canons, some of which we shall have occasion to alledge.

But, *Thirdly*, Altho' *Schism* deserves Excommunication, and the Canons denounce it against *Schismatics*, yet, you'll say, if the Governours of the Church do not think fit to inflict the Sentence upon them, they ought not to be treated as Excommunicates. 'Tis true, they ought not: And yet here it is to be considered, *First*, That *Schismatics* are in some cases, by several Canons, even of our own Church, declared to be excommunicated *ipso facto*: And, *Secondly*, That they always excommunicate themselves by their Schism.

(a) Can. 5,  
6, 7, 8, 9.

*First*, Several Canons of the Church, and of our (a) own Church in particular, declare *Schismatics*, in some cases, to be excommunicated *ipso facto*. Now altho' this is but *Sententia lata à Jure*, a Sentence pass'd by the Law, and it is generally held requisite there should be also *Sententia lata à Judice*, a Sentence pass'd by the Judge, before they are treated as excommunicate Persons: yet since it is plain, that these *ipso facto* Excommunications do intend and effect somewhat more, than those which are *Commminatory*, and *only threaten* the Sentence; That cannot be less where the Crime is confess'd and avow'd too, (as in open *Schism* it always is) than a *Suspension from the Participation of the Holy Communion*, which is one of the least Degrees of the Church's Censures.

How-

However, in the second place it is certain, That *Hereticks and Schismatics* always, *excommunicate themselves*; that is, they as effectually cut themselves off from the Communion of the Church and the Rights annexed to it, as other Sinners are cut off by her Censurers; and for this also we have an Apostolical Canon. It is St. Paul's Injunction to Titus, to whom he had committed the Government of the Church of Crete, *A Man that is an Heretick after the first and second Admonition reject, knowing that he that is such, is subverted and sinneth, being condemned of himself.* Titus c. 3.  
v. 10. 11. Not that all Hereticks are condemned of themselves, as knowing in their own Consciences the Doctrine they teach to be false; for without doubt many of them think themselves in the right. But they are *condemned of themselves*, because they cut themselves off from the Communion of the Church *by their own act*, whereas other Sinners are cut off by the Church's Censures; so that it is not so much by their false Doctrine, but by their Separation from the Church, that they properly *condemn themselves*, and this brings Schismatics under the same *Self-condemnation*. And as we have St. Cyprian's Authority for this sense of the Words, so he also applies them to the *Novatian* Schismatics, in his Epistle to Magnus, where after he had quoted this Injunction of St. Paul to Titus, he explains who this *Self-condemned* Heretick is, *who is not, saith he, cast out of the Church by the Bishop, but voluntarily separates from it, being through his heretical Presumption condemned by himself.*

---

(a) Qui non ab Episcopi eiectus, sed sponte Ecclesiâ profugus & hereticâ præsumptione à semetipso damnatus, Ep. 69. Edit. Oxon.

St. *Jerom* interprets this place after the same manner, and likewise extends it to Schism. *Therefore, saith he, he is said to be condemned by himself: because a Fornicator, an Adulterer, a Murtherer, and other wicked Persons are cast out of the Church by the Governors of it. But Hereticks pass this sentence on themselves, by separating from the Church on their own choice, which Separation seems to be this Self-condemnation.* After which, taking notice of the difference betwixt Heresie and Schism, he says, the latter equally makes a Separation from the Church. Although after such Authorities for so obvious and natural, an Interpretation we need add no more, yet let me give you the pious and learned Dr. *Hammond's* note on this place, *Every one who submits not to, but separates from the Orthodox Church, whose Member and Subject he is (and this every Heretick and Schismatick doth) is properly said to be Self-condemned. And therefore though to such an one, as to any other Malefactor, the first and second Admonition, v. 10. be due, which in all that are not reformed by those, is wont to bring on the sentence of Excommunication; yet there is no need to proceed to that, because he by contumacy and non-submission to the Church-ruler inflicts this upon himself. The appointment therefore is more agreeable to this Case, that men avoid him, v. 10. as one that is already excommunicate by his own, and so needs not the Judge's Sentence.*

To which give me leave to add, the Testimonies of Mr. *Thorndike*, and Dr. *Barrow*, not only

---

(b) Propterea vero à semetipso dicitur esse damnatus: quia fornicator, adulter homicida, &c. cetera vitia per sacerdotes Ecclesia propelluntur; Heretici autem in semetipsis suo arbitrio de Ecclesia recedentes: quæ recessio, propriæ conscientie videtur esse damnatio. Hieron. in locum.

because



because they were Great Men, but because though they differ'd in their Opinions about the Nature of the Unity of the Catholick Church, or rather about the Foundation of it ; for if I am not mistaken Dr. *Barrow* doth after all as good as yield, even that kind of Unity in the Catholick Church, which Mr. *Thorndike* contends for, only he will have it arise from the *voluntary consent* of the Governours of the Church, and not from *Divine Obligation* ; but however they differ'd in that, they both agreed, that they who violate the Unity of the Church in which they reside, by separating from it, do *Excommunicate themselves*. Which shews us by the way, that the Novel Conceit of stated Separation from the Church, and coming to it again when they think fit, must appear intolerable to any who leave the Church a Unity of any kind.

But to return to their Testimonies, Mr. *Thorndike* says, *There are two sorts of excommunicate Persons, one are they that excommunicate themselves, the other they that are excommunicated by the Church.* For *though they excommunicate themselves, yet because they are to be avoided by the Flock from whence they depart, when they excommunicate themselves, they are to be held as if they were excommunicated by the Church.* On the one side, all Papists excommunicate themselves, on the other side, all that run into Conventicles. Dr. *Barrow* says, *All that withdraw their Communion or Obeisance from particular Churches, fairly established (unto which they do belong, or where they reside) do incur the guilt of Schism : For such Persons being de jure, subject to those particular Churches, and excommunicating themselves, do consequently sever themselves*

A Discourse of the Forbearance of Penalties. p. 161.

Ibid. p. 162.

A Discourse concerning the Unity of the Church, p. 46.

Ibid. p. 47.

*selves from the Catholick Church; they commit great wrong toward that particular Church, and toward the whole Church of Christ. Self-Excommunication or Spiritual Felony, de se, doth involve the Churches Excommunication deserving it, and preventing it.*

Indeed if they, who separate themselves, are not held by the Church as excommunicated, it were easie for an Offender to elude the Discipline of the Church by separating from it, and entring the Communion of Schismatics, if he did not excommunicate himself by joyning with those who are esteem'd so, and thereby inflict on himself the very Punishment he design'd to avoid. Thus St. Cyprian observes, That the Presbyter *Novatus*, who justly feared Deposition and Excommunication too for his enormous Crimes, began his Schism in the Church of Carthage, (c) That he who deserved to be utterly excluded out of the Church, might prevent this Judgement by a voluntary Separation from it, as if, saith this Father, to have anticipated the sentence, were to have escaped the punishment.

But I would not be mistaken, as if I affirm'd, That they who excommunicate themselves by Schism, do fall under all the effects of that which is call'd the *Greater Excommunication*. It doth not affect them in their Civil Rights, by the Intervention of Humane Laws, nor oblige others to withdraw from their Company; but since it is a Forfeiture of all their Spiritual Rights, which are annexed to the Communion of the Church her Officers justly may, nay, ought to repel them from the Holy Offices, most

---

(c) *Ut qui ejici de Ecclesiâ, & excludi habebat, judicium sacerdotum voluntaria pracederet, discessione quasi evasisse sit pœnam, prævenisse sententiam.*  
Epist. 53.

certainly

certainly from the Lord's Table, until upon the renouncing of their Schism, they are restored to her Communion: If St. Paul commands Titus to reject such as were thus Self-condemned. If he exhorts the Romans to (b) Mark those who cause Divisions among them contrary to the Doctrine they had learned and avoid them: If the Apostolical Canon (c) and the Council of Antioch (d) denounce excommunication against those who pray with, or receive to their Communion Excommunicates, or Persons out of Communion: If all this lays any Obligation upon us, it cannot oblige us to less than to avoid and discountenance their Schism, and till they renounce it, not to receive them to the Holy Communion.

(b) Rom. 16.

(c) Εἰ τις ἀκοινῶνῃσιν καὶ ἐν οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ἀποει-  
λέσθω Can. 10.

(d) Μὴ ἔσται ἡ κοινὴ τοῖς ἀκοινῶνῃσιν, &c.  
Can. 2.

But Fourthly, They who by the Churches excommunication or their own, were put out of the Communion of their own Church, were thereby also excluded from the Communion of all the Churches in the World. For since the Catholick Church is but one Society, of which every Church is a part, as he that is received a Member into any part of it, becomes thereby a Member of the whole: (For though every Person is Baptized in some particular Church, yet the Apostle saith, *We are all Baptized into one Body*) so that Member which is cut off from any part, is thereby cut off from the whole Body. Indeed if he that was received by Baptism into a particular Church, did not thereby comennc a Member of the whole Catholick Church, when he removed into another Country he must lose the Benefit of publick Communion and Worship; and on the other hand, if he that was excommunicated from one Church, did not stand excommunicate to the whole Christian World, the Discipline of the Church might easily be

E

cluded,



eluded, and he that was excommunicated from his own Church, by only changing his habitation, might be in full Communion in another. To prevent which, by the ancient Discipline, no Strangers were admitted to Communion, without *Communicatory letters*, certifying that they were in Communion with their own Church; and because Hereticks, Schismatics, and other excommunicate Persons could not obtain such Testimonials, wheresoever they went they found all other Churches shut against them, as well as their own.

This Discipline not to receive to Communion those who were out of the Communion of their own Church, descended without doubt from Apostolical Practice; certainly *Timothy* would not have received into the Church of *Ephesus*, those whom *Titus* had rejected from that of *Crete*; and it was always held of so great moment, that it is guarded by several ancient Canons, particularly by the 12 Apostolical Canon. (e) *If any Clergy-man or Lay-man, that is excommunicated, or not fit to be received, going to another City, i. e. another Diocess, is received there without commendatory Letters, he that receives him, and he that is received shall be excommunicated.* Which Canon is enforced by the great Council of *Nice*, in her 5th. Canon (f) in these words, *Let the sentence be in force according to the Canon (i. e. the aforesaid Apostolical Canon, and 'tis one of the many authentick Proofs of their great Antiquity)*

---

(e) \*Εἰ τις κληρικὸς ἢ λαϊκὸς ἀρρωισμῶς, ἢ τοι ἄδεκτος ἀπελθὼν, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ πόλει δεχθῇ ἀνὰ γραμμάτων συστάτικῶν ἀρροειζέειν καὶ ὁ δεξάμενος καὶ ὁ δεχθεὶς. Can. Ap. 12.

(f) Κελεύεται ἡ γνῶμη αὐτῆς κανόνα τῆς διαφόρου τῆς ὑφ' ἐτέρας ἀποβληθείσης ὑφ' ἐτέρας μὴ προσέειδος. Con. Nic. Can. 5.

which

*which decrees, that they who are cast out by some, be not admitted by others. Both which Canons, expressly forbid the excommunicates of one Church to be received by another.*

Nor are the Canons less exprefs against the admission of each others *Schismaticks*. The 31st. *Apostolical-Canon*, as you see forbids *any Church to admit not only excommunicates, but also others who are not received, or fit to be received into their own Church.* And to enforce the same Discipline the Council of *Antioch* (a), forbids the praying with those who do not communicate in prayer with the Church, and to receive those to Communion who do not Communicate with another Church, and the Council of (b) *Laodicea* saith, *we ought not to pray with a Heretick or with a Schismatick.*

These were the Laws of the Primitive Church, and her Practice was exactly agreeable to them. I'll give an instance or two in each Case, first with respect to those who are excommunicated by the Church; as *Marcion* was by his own Father the Bishop of *Sinope* in *Pontus*, after which he came to *Rome*, and desired to be received to Communion there, but was answer'd, (c) *That they could not do it without the consent of his Father.* So *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome*, without any farther enquiry, absolutely refused Communion to *Feliciſſimus* when he came thither, because he stood excommunicated

---

(a) Μη ὕξῃναι σὺνδέχεσθαι τοῖς μὴ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ σὺνδεχομένοις μηδὲ ἐν ἑτέρᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑποδέχεσθαι τὸν ἐν ἑτέρᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ μὴ σὺνδεχομένον. Can. 2.

(b) Οὐ δὲ αἱρετικῶ ἢ χισματικῶ σὺνδέχεσθαι. Can. 33.

(c) Ὅτι ἂν δυνάμεθα ἀνδρὶ τῷ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς τιμῆς παλῆς σε τὸτο ποιῆσαι. Epiphani. Hær. 42.

by St. Cyprian at Carthage ; (d) and as for those who had excommunicated themselves by Schism, the Practice of the Church was the very same. Thus when Maximus the Presbyter, and Augendus the Deacon, with the other Messengers of Novatian came to Carthage, St. Cyprian (e) absolutely refused to admit them to Communion, because they were Schismatics from their own Church. Thus St. Basil forewarns his People, (f) That if any of them withdrew from his Communion, they would at the same time separate themselves from the universal Church.

Well, but what is all this to Dissenters ? Are they Schismatics ? Schism is a crime of so hainous a nature, and I have so great compassion for those that are involved in it, that I had much rather every one could be acquitted from that guilt, than charge any Man with it ; for when I consider that we *must all stand before the Judgement seat of Christ*, I feel so much for my fellow Mortals, that I wish every Man's Burthen were lighter than it is, and should with pleasure contribute to make it so, so far am I from desiring to add one grain to its weight ; but this very compassion for their Persons excites us freely to tell them, both of their Sin and Danger ; whereas to soften it by an affected Moderation, is to encourage them in it. We must judge of things as they are, and speak of them as we judge, and when we do so, we judge, and speak truly ; and falsely, if

---

(d) *Ob crimina sua plurima & gravissima abstentum, rejectum à te illic esse.*  
Epist. 59. Cypr. Cornelio fratri.

(e) *A communicatione eos nostra statim cohibendos esse censuimus.* Ep. 44.

(f) Ὡς ὁ ἢ πρὸς ἡμᾶς κοινωνίαν ἀποδιδράχων, μὴ λαμβανέτω ὑμῶν ἢ ἀκρίθειαν, πάσης ἑαυτὸν ἢ ἐκκλησίας ἀπορρήνους. Basil.  
Ep. 75. vers. fin.



otherwise, so that here's no room for Moderation or Immoderation, but for Truth or Falsehood; and 'tis not Moderation but Evidence, that must regulate our Judgements. It is not then Truth and Falsehood; nor moral Good and Evil; but the Goods and Evils of this Life which are the proper objects of Moderation; and it is employ'd not about the Understanding and Judgment, but about the Affections and Passions. It is that Virtue which sets bounds to our love and hatred, to our desires and aversions, to our hopes and fears, and to our joys and griefs; and therefore let Moderation be never so great a Virtue, it has nothing to do with our Judgment of things. We ought to judge that to be Unity which is so, and the breach of it to be Schism; and yet whilst we judge of Sins as they are, we are to extend our Charity to the Persons that are guilty of them; we are to treat them with Humanity and Compassion, we are to judge no worse of them than we have clear Evidence of the Degrees of their guilt, and to hope the best where we have no Evidence to the contrary. And if they will call this Moderation, which is properly a branch of Charity, I'll not contend with 'em for a word, and will allow it to be as great a Virtue as they desire; only let them remember, - that Zeal for the Unity of the Church, and the Preservation of it; Zeal to recover Men from their Sins, and to prevent others from falling into them, are as great, if not greater Virtues.

And having made this Apology for any thing, that may seem at least, severe in what I have said or shall say of the Dissenter's Separation, I shall not scruple to charge them with Schism, as all the Orthodox, and the learned Divines of our Church

F

have

by St. Cyprian at Carthage ; (d) and as for those who had excommunicated themselves by Schism, the Practice of the Church was the very same. Thus when Maximus the Presbyter, and Augendus the Deacon, with the other Messengers of Novatian came to Carthage, St. Cyprian (e) absolutely refused to admit them to Communion, because they were Schismatics from their own Church. Thus St. Basil forewarns his People, (f) That if any of them withdrew from his Communion, they would at the same time separate themselves from the universal Church.

Well, but what is all this to Dissenters ? Are they Schismatics ? Schism is a crime of so hainous a nature, and I have so great compassion for those that are involved in it, that I had much rather every one could be acquitted from that guilt, than charge any Man with it ; for when I consider that we *must all stand before the Judgement seat of Christ*, I feel so much for my fellow Mortals, that I wish every Man's Burthen were lighter than it is, and should with pleasure contribute to make it so, so far am I from desiring to add one grain to its weight ; but this very compassion for their Persons excites us freely to tell them, both of their Sin and Danger ; whereas to soften it by an affected Moderation, is to encourage them in it. We must judge of things as they are, and speak of them as we judge, and when we do so, we judge, and speak truly ; and falsely, if

(d) Ob crimina sua plurima & gravissima abstentum, rejectum à te illic esse. Epist. 59. Cypr. Cornelio fratri.

(e) A communicatione eos nostra statim cohibendos esse censuimus. Ep. 44.

(f) ὅστις ὁ ἑκαστος ἡμῶν κοινωνίαν ἀποδείξῃ, μὴ λανθανέτω ἑμῶν ἢ ἀκρίβειαν, πᾶσις ἑαυτὸν ἢ ἐκκλησίας ἀπορρήνους. Basil. Ep. 75. vers. fin.

otherwise, so that here's no room for Moderation or Immoderation, but for Truth or Falsehood ; and 'tis not Moderation but Evidence , that must regulate our Judgements. It is not then Truth and Falsehood ; nor moral Good and Evil ; but the Goods and Evils of this Life which are the proper objects of Moderation ; and it is employ'd not about the Understanding and Judgment, but about the Affections and Passions. It is that Virtue which sets bounds to our love and hatred, to our desires and aversions, to our hopes and fears, and to our joys and griefs ; and therefore let Moderation be never so great a Virtue, it has nothing to do with our Judgment of things. We ought to judge that to be Unity which is so, and the breach of it to be Schism ; and yet whilst we judge of Sins as they are, we are to extend our Charity to the Persons that are guilty of them ; we are to treat them with Humanity and Compassion, we are to judge no worse of them than we have clear Evidence of the Degrees of their guilt, and to hope the best where we have no Evidence to the contrary. And if they will call this Moderation, which is properly a branch of Charity, I'll not contend with 'em for a word, and will allow it to be as great a Virtue as they desire ; only let them remember, - that Zeal for the Unity of the Church, and the Preservation of it ; Zeal to recover Men from their Sins, and to prevent others from falling into them, are as great, if not greater Virtues.

And having made this Apology for any thing, that may seem at least, severe in what I have said or shall say of the Dissenter's Separation, I shall not scruple to charge them with Schism, as all the Orthodox, and the learned Divines of our Church

F

have



have always done. For if our Lord founded his Church in a *Subordination* of Officers, by investing the *Twelve Apostles* (*whom alone he sent as his Father sent him*) with a Power Superior to the *Seventy Disciples*; if the Apostles exercised a Power Superior to all the other Officers of the Church; if their Power as Church-Governors did not die with them, but as appears from their Commission, was to continue with their Successors to the end of the World; if the earliest Records of the Church assure us, that this Superior Power, thus founded in *Divine Institution* and *Apostolical Practice*, was continued in the Bishops as Successors of the Apostles, having Presbyters and Deacons subject to them; if we have as certain an account of the *Succession* of the Bishops to the Apostles in the greater Churches, as *Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria*, in those very times, in which alone the Presbyterians doubt it, as we have of the *Succession* of the Archbishops of *Canterbury* since the Reformation; if the Authors who attest this *Superiority of Bishops*, lived some of them in the Apostolical age it self, and some of the rest who attest *That*, and the *Succession* too, lived much nearer to the Apostles, than we do to the Reformation, so that any Man may with as much confidence say, we do not know whether this Church was governed by Bishops when it reform'd, as say these Authors did not know whether Bishops as Superior to Presbyters, immediately succeeded the Apostles in the Government of the Church; and lastly, if the Episcopal Government has descended with the other parts of Christianity, and with the same Evidence, thro' all Ages since, and extended it self with it into all parts of the World, insomuch that all the Adversaries

ries of this Government have not, after they have search'd every corner of Antiquity, yet been able to name one Church in any Age, or part of the World that was not governed by Bishops; if all this be true, as it certainly is, then for Christians to separate from the Communion of their Bishop, is not only to violate the Unity of the Church, but to separate from that Authority which Christ has established in it, and all the Benefits of the new Covenant which are administred only by that Authority, and in that Communion. But to set up an opposite Communion, is in effect to renounce that Authority Christ has left to his Church, and to erect a new Authority of their own, which is a most Sacrilegious Usurpation, as to join in such a Communion, is a Schism of the highest kind.

And having beheld the Divine Original, the Perpetuity, and Universality of the Episcopal Authority and Government; Let me now make the same Challenge to the Presbyterians, which *Tertulian* made to some Hereticks in his Age, (a) *Let them produce the Originals of their Churches; Let them derive the Succession of their Ministers from the Apostles*, how far back into Antiquity can they trace their Line of Succession? Into Antiquity do I say? I doubt they'll be forc'd to stop within the Memory of Man; for higher they cannot go, than that fatal Revolt which their Fathers made from their Bishops and from Episcopacy it self, and assumed to themselves the Power of Ordination, and of govern-

---

(a) *Edant ergo origines Ecclesiarum suarum: Evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita per Successiones ab initio, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis vel Apostolicis viris, &c. Tertull. De Præscrip. Hæretic. c. 32.*

ing the Church about 60 Years ago; for before that time, there were no such Presbyters in this Church, by whom they can derive such a Power, nor any indeed in the whole Christian world for 1500 Years after Christ; Here then was the Original of their Church. This the Epocha of their Succession: so that here's a Gulph fixt that they can never pass, for these revolting Presbyters, having no Predecessors from whom they can make their claim, or, as St. Cyprian saith, *Succedunt nemini, à seipso orti*, *They succeeded to no body*, by whom they can derive such a Power, but proceeded from themselves, and were the Originals of their own Authority. And what is, if this be not, as the same Saint saith, *Humanam Instituire Ecclesiam*, *a Church of Humane Institution?*

I might alledge numerous Authorities from the Fathers, but I'll only produce the *Canons* of some of the ancient *Councils*, wherein we have their Authorities united in condemning this Schism. The *Apostolical Canon* (c) saith, *If any Presbyter condemning his own Bishop shall hold a separate meeting, and erect another Altar, having nothing to charge his Bishop in Piety (d) or Justice, let him be deposed as an ambitious Affecter of Government, for he is an Usurper: Likewise as many of the Clergy as joyn with*

---

(c) Εἰ τις πρεσβύτερος κατὰ φρονήσας τῷ ἰδίῳ Ἐπισκόπῳ χωρὶς συναγωγῆς, καὶ θυσιάσκειον ἑτέρον πύξῃ, μηδὲν κατεργαζόμενος τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ ἐν εὐσεβείᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, καθαιρεῖται ὡς φίλαρχος; τύραν γὰρ ἔστιν ὡσαύτως. ὃ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοὶ, καὶ ὅσοι ἀνὰ ὡς πρεσβυτέρων οἱ καϊκοὶ ἀφαιρεθῶσαν, Can. 32.

(d) In this Case the *Canons* provided for a regular Procedure, in the Synod of the Province.



him shall be deposed, and the Laicks excommunicated. The Council of Gangra Decrees, (a) If any Man shall hold a private Meeting out of the Church, and presume to celebrate Divine Service, the officiating Presbyter not being thereunto licensed by the Bishop, let him be Anathema. The Council of Antioch Decrees, (b) If any Presbyter or Deacon despising his own Bishop, hath separated from the Church, and set up an Altar in a private Congregation, and shall refuse to obey his Bishop calling him a first and second time, he shall be absolutely deposed as an incurable Person, and one that cannot retain his Honour. The second General Council, (c) Ranks those with Hereticks who pretend to profess the true Faith, yet make a Schism, and hold opposite Assemblies to the Canonical Bishops. The fourth General Council Decrees, (d) If any of the Clergy or Monks shall be found conspiring or making Fraternities, or contriving any thing against the Bishops or their Fellow-Clergymen, let them be utterly degraded; And again, the same Council declares, That (e) to put a Bishop into the Rank of a Presbyter is Sacrilege.

(a) Ἐἰ τις ἄλλος ἢ Ἐκκλησίαν, κατ' ἰδίαν Ἐκκλησιάζει, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἢ Ἐκκλησίας τὰς ἑκκλησίας ἐθέλει πρῶτον μὴ σωόντων τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γυνάμιν ἢ Ἐπισκόπου ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Can. 6.

(b) Ἐἰ τις πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος καθ' ἑαυτὸν τῶν ἰδίων Ἐπισκόπου ἀφώρεισεν ἑαυτὸν ἢ Ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἰδίᾳ σωήσῃ καὶ δυσιασήμεον ἐπιζητήσῃ, καὶ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ πρὸς καλεσάμενους ἀπειθοίη, καὶ μὴ βέλοισιν αὐτῷ, πείθεσθαι, μηδὲ ὑπακούειν, καὶ πρῶτον καὶ δεύτερον καλέσῃ, τῶτον καθαίρειται πάντεσσιν, καὶ μηκέτι δεσποτίας τυγχάνειν, μήτε δυνάμει λαμβάνειν ἢ ἑαυτῷ τίμω. Can. 5.

(c) Αἰρετικοὶς ὃ λέγουσιν τοῦ τε πάλου—πρὸς ὃ τῶτοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἢ ὑπὸν προποικίλους ὁμολογῶν, ἀποχιδέντας ὃ καὶ ἀντισυνάφους τοῖς κανονικοῖς ἢ Ἐπισκόποις. Can. 6.

(d) Εἰ τινες τοίνυν κληρικοί ἢ μονάζοντες ἀρεθίσαν, ἢ σωμονύμφοι ἢ φασειάζοντες, ἢ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς τυγχόντες Ἐπισκόποις ἢ σωμακλειακοῖς ἐκπιπτεύωσι πάντῃ τῶ οἰκείῳ βαθμῇ. Conc. Chalced. Can. 18.

(e) Ἐπισκοποῦντες πρεσβύτεροι βαθμὴν φέρειν Ἱερωσύνην ὅτιν. Can. 29.

These were the Decrees of the highest Authority in the Primitive Church against Presbyters, who made a Schism from their Bishop, by exercising the Presbyters Office without or against his Authority ; If you ask what were the Decrees against Presbyters that Usurp the Episcopal Office it self. I must answer, there were none, for the same reason, that neither *Solon* nor *Romulus* made any Laws against Parricide, because they imagined none would attempt so great a Crime. But since there were such Decrees against Presbyters, who executed only their own Office without the Authority of their Bishops, what *Anathema's* might have been expected from those Councils against Presbyters that usurp the Episcopal Office it self, by assuming to themselves the Power of Ordination, and governing the Church in opposition to it ? We have of late heard much from the Dissenters, of Archbishop *Usher's* Model of Episcopacy, which I perceive by an Advertisement is ready to be published by them ; they would do well to consider, that when that very learned Primate was making favourable Allowances towards some of the Foreign Churches who have not Bishops ; even then when he went to the utmost lengths of his Condemnation, he could find no *Salvo* for our Presbyterians, but leaves them under the guilt of their Schism, for he adds, (f) *Yet on the other hand, holding as I do, that a Bishop hath Superiority in degree above Presbyters ; you may easily judge that the*

---

(f) This was written in his Note-book with his own hand, dated 1655. a little before his Death, as we are assured by the Lord Primate's Grandson, *James Tyrrel*, Esq; in the Appendix to his Grandfather's Life, p. 6. when Episcopacy was at its lowest Ebb in this Island.

*Ordination made by such Presbyters as have severed themselves from their Bishops, cannot possibly by me be excused from being Schismatical.*

As for the Reasons which the Dissenters alledge to justify so desperate a Schism, they have been so often and fully answer'd, that it is a wonder they have not generally returned into the bosom of the Church; if it were not a greater, how they could ever break the Unity of it for such Reasons. For among all the Divisions that have infested the Church of God, none ever began a Schism about the External Rites of Religion, except our Dissenters in *England*, who for the very same Reasons, that they have separated from this Church, must have separated from the Primitive Church, which observed more Rites than ours; and if even the Primitive Church was not Holy and Pure enough for them to Communicate with, let them consider what becomes of Two Articles of their Creed, *The Holy Catholick Church, and the Communion of Saints.*

As for the peculiar Reasons which the Occasional Conformists give for their Separation, they also have often been fairly answer'd, particularly in a late Book entituled, *Occasional Conformity, a most unjustifiable Practice.*

But to leave the Occasional Conformist, and return to the Members of the Church, they must all believe the Dissenters Schismaticks, or pass themselves for unsincere Members of it, for as a War cannot be just on both sides, so a breach cannot be made in the Unity of the Church, but one side must be guilty of Schism. In short, they must believe the Dissenters have just cause to separate, or they have not; if they believe the  
Dissenters.



Dissenters have just cause to separate, and unlawful Terms of Communion are the only just cause, how can they acquit themselves of insincerity, by continuing in a Church from which they believe they ought to separate : But if they'll say, the Dissenters have no just cause for their Separation, they condemn them of Schism, for all acknowledge a causeless Separation to be so.

And having gone through the five Propositions, we have prevented the main Question, *Whether the Dissenters ought to be admitted to the Holy Communion, before they renounce their Schism* ; for it has received its Answer already in these Propositions, all which concur in one decisive conclusion against it. For if the Church hath by Divine Right a Power to excommunicate ; if Schismatics as well as other Offenders deserve Excommunication, and the Church by her Canons denounces it against them ; and if when she doth not inflict it on particular Persons by her Sentence, yet they always excommunicate themselves by their Schism, and thereby lose their Right of approaching the Lord's Table, as well as those who are excommunicated by the Church ; and if they who are cut off from their own Church either way, do by the ancient Discipline stand excommunicated from all the Churches in the World ; and lastly, if this be the condition of all Schismatics, and our Dissenters are such, then certainly they ought not to be admitted to the Holy Communion until they renounce their Schism.

This is a necessary consequence from the foregoing Principles, and it is in vain to dispute this, unless you can destroy those, which will be no very easie task,

task, for they are not private Fancies or novel Opinions, but they are founded on that sense of Scripture, which has been received down all along by constant Tradition, attested by the universal Practice of the Primitive Church, and ratified by the Decrees of General Councils, for I have alledged no Canons, but either of the first *four General Councils*, which the Laws of the State as well as of the Church of *England*, receive with great reverence; or those which are stiled Apostolical, which tho' not made by the Apostles, approach the nearest to their time; or else the Canons of Provincial Councils, but of such only as were elder than the *1st* General Council or not later than the *4th*, and whose Canons were all taken into that *1st* Code of the universal Church, which was ratified by the fourth Oecumenical Council, so that altho' originally they were the Canons of Provincial Synods, Conc. Chalced. Can. 1. they have thereby obtained the Sanction and Authority of a General Council.

These are the highest Authorities in the Catholick Church, and which have ever been, and ever will be held venerable in Christendom; and if I have not mistaken their sense, as I am pretty certain I have not, I am secure under so great Authorities, and he that attacks this Discourse, in order to defend *Occasional Conformity*, or the *Admission of Schismatics to the Holy Sacrament*, must set himself in opposition to the Laws of the Catholick Church, and its universal Practice in the Primitive Ages; and that not in matters of small moment, but which have ever been esteem'd Essential to the Church's *Unity*, and absolutely necessary to maintain *Discipline*. This will be no very decent employment for any one who expresses a concern for either, and a Man need be all

Synod. Lond.  
Anno 1571.  
Cap. de Conci-  
onat.

over Innovation before he undertakes it, but 'twill be still less decent in a Member of the Church of *England*, which has so great a Veneration for that Authority, which requires her Ministers to teach the People *nothing but what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and what the Catholick Fathers, and ancient Bishops have collected out of that Doctrine*, and which as I have already observed, has conform'd her Laws to those of the universal Church.

So particularly in the main Case before us, she enjoins her Ministers *not to admit Schismatics to the Holy Communion* by her 27th Canon; and who these Schismatics are, she describes in the Body of that Canon: such as *will not receive kneeling, or as refuse to be present at the publick Prayers according to the Orders of the Church of England*. And here let the Occasional Conformist observe, the Church orders all her Members *duely to resort to the Church upon all Sundays and Holidays*, as appears from her 90th Canon; and therefore he who only once for an Office, or it may be once a Year, is present at the Liturgy, is *not present according to the Orders of the Church of England*, and therefore by this Canon ought not to be admitted to the Lord's Table: or such Schismatics as *are common and notorious Depravers of the Book of Common Prayer and the Administration of the Sacraments, and Orders, Rites, and Ceremonies therein prescribed, &c.* None of these are to be admitted to the Communion, except every such Person shall first acknowledge to the Minister, before the Churchwardens his Repentance, for the same and promise that he will do so no more.

Nay, so far is the Church from admitting Schismatics to the Holy Communion, that by her 9th Canon



Canon she declares, *those that shall separate from the Communion of Saints, as it is approved by the Apostle's Rules in the Church of England, and combine themselves in a new Brotherhood, accounting the Christians who are conformable to the Doctrine, Governments, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Church of England, as prophane and unmeet for them to join with in Christian Profession, to be excommunicated, ipso facto, and not restored, but by the Archbishop after their Repentance, and publick Revocation of such their wicked Errors.* And this Canon also, if I am not mistaken reaches the *Occasional Conformist*, for although he doth not hold those that conform to the Church to be prophane, yet he accounts them not pure enough with whom he may live in constant Communion as a Fellow-member, and that alone is *to join with them in the Christian Profession*, and therefore separates from the Communion of the Church, and joins himself to a new Communion, or Brotherhood of which he declares himself a *stated Member*.

Indeed whoever considers the Discipline of the Church of *England*, and by what deliberate steps and gradual advances she leads her own children to the Holy Table, as the highest Act of Communion, and with what care she guards the Holy Mysteries from unqualified and rash Intrudors, will easily be convinced, she never design'd Schismatics should be admitted there.

*First*, She orders that none be baptised without Sponsors, who shall stipulate with the Church in the name of the Child, and give Security for his Education in the *Christian Religion*, and in the *Communion* of the Church; for they also are charged *to take care that when he is fit, he be brought to the Bishop for Confirmation*

See the Exhortation at the end of the Office of publick Baptism.

*Id. Can. 59,  
60, 61. And  
the Rubricks  
after the  
Catechism.*

*Rubrick after  
the Order of  
Confirmation.*

*firmation, and in the mean time not the Sureties only are charged with his Education, but the Parish Priest or Curate, is particularly enjoyn'd to take great care to Catechise, to instruct and examine the youth, and the common People in the Principles of the Christian Religion according to the Church Catechism; and enjoins, that none be presented to the Bishop for Confirmation till they can give an account, and reason of their Faith, of which the Curate who is to present them, is the Judge; and not even then to be confirmed, unless the Bishop approves of them.*

Farther the Church strictly enjoins, that *none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.* Now this is a Law of the Land as well of the Church, for all the *Rubricks* are confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*. And what multitudes of Occasional Conformists doth this one Law exclude from the Holy Communion? For how few of them have ever been *confirmed*? And if they be not already, they must be great *Hypocrites* to say *they desire it*, desire to be confirm'd Members of the Episcopal Church, when they are no Members of it, nor ever intend to be. Now the great reason why the Church requires Persons to be confirm'd before they come to the Holy Communion, is because having been baptised in their infancy, upon a contract made by Sureties in their Names; they might now in their own Persons renew and confirm that contract, and upon it be acknowledged for Members of the Church by the Imposition of the hands, and the Benediction of its chief Pastors. Hence 'tis plain, the Church designs none should be admitted to this highest and most Solemn Act of Communion, until they are

*con-*

*confirmed Members of the Church ; when they are so, she obliges them at the Age of 16 to receive this Holy Sacrament thrice a year at least. But still to preserve the Dignity of these Mysteries, and as much as may be the integrity of her Communion, by her 26th Canon, she enjoyns her Ministers to admit no notorious Offenders ; and by her 27th Canon, no Schismatics, to the participation of 'em : And that neither may gain a surreptitious Admission, the very next Canon forbids any Strangers from other Parishes to be received to the Holy Communion ; and the first Rubrick before that Office requires, so many as intend to be partakers of it, shall signifie their Names to the Curate, at least some time the day before.*

This is the Pious care ; this the wise Discipline of our Holy Mother the Church of *England*, enjoin'd by her Rubricks and Canons, which is utterly trampled on by the Intrusion of Occasional Conformists ; Here comes one who is no Member of the Church, nor intends to be one, who will not be under the Minister's Cure, of whom he can give little or no account, and of whom it may be he has no Knowledge : It is possible he may never have been baptised, he may be excommunicated ; he may be Socinian or Deist ; 'tis forty to one if he be confirm'd, to be sure he does not desire it ; however, he has an Office, and that he may elude the Law demands to be admitted. This is not regularly and reverently to approach, but rather to invade the Lord's Table : and to admit such a one, is not more against our own, than the Primitive Discipline.

In a printed *Speech* said to be spoken in the House of Lords, by a learned Prelate, upon the Bill against  
 I Occasional



*Occasional Conformity*, it is affirm'd, That *our Legal establishment founded on the Primitive Pattern is the true measure of our Church, and those who rise above it, as are as much out of the way, as those that fall below it.* It must be own'd, this is so true a measure that none can refuse to put the issue of this Cause upon it, and if the rest of the Speech was against the Bill, yet we need no other measure, than what these words give us, to condemn the Practice which the Bill would restrain.

We have seen the *Primitive Pattern*, if the *Laws* of the Catholick Church, and its universal *Practice* in the first Ages can shew it us : And is there the least shadow of Occasional Conformity, or of the allowance of it in this Primitive Pattern ? Do we find Schismatics received at the Primitive Altars ? Or one Canon in the whole Code that allows it ? Is not the Practice of the Catholick Church one continued Precedent against it ? Is it not the very reverse of its Discipline, and a Contradiction to all its Laws of Communion ? We have seen our *Legal Establishment* too, if the *Rubricks and Canons* are a part of it, and find they are conformable to that *Primitive Pattern on which they are founded*, and that Occasional Conformity, or the Admission of Schismatics to the Communion, is expressly condemned by both ; and if this be the true measure of the Church of *England*, *Not to admit Schismatics until they renounce their Schism* ; Then, as not to receive them upon their Repentance would be to *rise above* it ; so to admit them to the Holy Communion without renouncing their Schism, is to *fall below* it ; if any should be against receiving them upon their Repentance, they would be High-Churchmen indeed, but I know not such a

Church-

Churchman in *England*, it would be not only to rise higher than the Church, but would be a strain beyond Novatianism it self; and for those that favour the latter, and are for admitting them without renouncing or entirely forsaking their Schism, they certainly fall *below this true measure of the Church*. But I shall leave them to consider that, and let them fall gently without so much as a term of Distinction.

Whilst I was considering the Primitive Pattern, I produced some Testimonies, as I might many, from that valuable Monument of the Ancient Discipline St. Cyprian's Epistles, I shall add one more from his Letter to Caldonius, &c. where speaking of the Schismatick *Felicissimus*, he saith, *Whosoever shall join himself to his Schism, let him know that he shall not communicate in the Church with us, who voluntarily chose to be separated from the Church*. After a certain learned \* Divine of the Church of *England*, had quoted this saying he made this remark, and had *we a St. Cyprian among us at this day, they would not be suffered to shift turns thus between a Church and a Conventicle; for he expressly declared, that those who communicated with Felicissimus, his Schismatical Presbyter, should not be suffered to communicate in the Church with him*. I need not add, that every Bishop is thus far a St. Cyprian, that he has the same Authority, and is under the same Obligations that he was, to preserve the Unity and Discipline of the Church. I shall close this appeal to the Catholick Church with a Challenge of the learned Mr. Thorndike, *Whosoever, saith he, the Church excommunicates for notorious and scandalous Sin, to restore him that is so excommunicate to Communion, would be to murder his Soul and Christianity both at once, not supposing some*

*Sed & quisquis se conspirationi, & factioni ejus adjunxerit, sciat se in Ecclesia nobiscum non esse Communicaturum, qui sponte maluit ab Ecclesia Leperari.*  
Epist. 41.  
There is the like Declaration in the 43 Epist.  
\* Dr. Sherlock in his Discourse about Church Unity. p. 473.  
Forbearance. p. 170, 171.  
propor-

proportionable Presumption of amendment in him that is restored. This therefore must hold as the reason of it holds, in those that excommunicate themselves ; in the reconciling of Hereticks and Schismatics to the Church. And this the whole Practice of the Church of God from the beginning shews them that are willing to understand the reason of it, before they tread that Authority under foot, which the common Christianity obliges all to follow. Then follows his Challenge in these words, *shew me, saith he, any Hereſe or Schism ever restored to the Church, without renouncing the same, and I will confess, that the Church it self turned Heretick or Schismatick from the same date.*

But here it may be objected, that the same Laws which obliges Persons to receive the Holy Sacrament as a Qualification for Offices, do oblige the Clergy to admit them to it. To which I answer, That as I have proved in the beginning of this Discourse, that Christ hath invested his Church with a Power to admit Persons into her Communion, and to exclude them from it, either in part or entirely ; so the Constitution of our Kingdom doth reserve to the Church all those Rights which Christ hath given her, and thus *Magna Charta* begins, *We have granted unto God, and by this our present Charter have confirmed for us, and for our Heirs for ever, that the Church of England shall be free, and enjoy all Her Rights entire, and her Liberties inviolable ; and it free in any thing, then certainly free in the exercise of those Spiritual Rights, with which its Officers are invested by a Divine Charter, free in the dispensing of those Mysteries of God whereof they are the only Stewards.* And it was with respect to this  
Greater



Greater Charter, that the late Lord Chief Justice *Hale* said of the Officers of the Church, *that they were the proper Judges appointed by Christ, to whom they themselves should apply Sacraments, or to whom they should deny them.* Indeed were not the Church free in the exercise of this Power ; notwithstanding *Her Rights* stand upon a Divine Charter, and are secured by the Great Charter of the Kingdom, establish'd by its Laws, and confirm'd by the Oaths of our Kings and Queens at their Coronations, she would be less free in this respect, and in a worse Condition, than any of the *Tolerated* Sects. But as that Lord Chief Justice derived the Church's Right from Divine Institution, so he knew the Laws of the Land left her free in the exercise of it. Indeed what the Church is possess'd of by Divine Right, no Humane Laws can deprive her of ; and if ever there should be such an attempt, 'tis certain, Christians must adhere to, and assert the Divine Institution, as it is certain, that *they must obey God, rather than Man*, but they must assert it by suffering, not with an armed Gospel, and acknowledge the Authority when they cannot obey the Law. Thus while we render to God the things that are God's, we shall render to *Cæsar* the things that are *Cæsar's*. Thus the Divine Institutions will be inviolably preserved to the end of the World, the Governments of the World never disturb'd by Religion, and God's Authority revered in Both.

But the Case before us stands in no need of this Defence ; for I presume we may lay down this for a Truth, That our Legislators never intended those Persons should be admitted to the Lord's Table, as a Legal Qualification, who they never design'd should

K.

be

Additional  
Notes on the  
Life and Death  
of Sir Mat-  
thew Hale,  
p. 41.

See the Dia-  
logue between  
Doctor and  
Student.

proportionable Presumption of amendment in him that is restored. This therefore must hold as the reason of it holds, in those that excommunicate themselves; in the reconciling of Hereticks and Schismaticks to the Church. And this the whole Practice of the Church of God from the beginning shews them that are willing to understand the reason of it, before they tread that Authority under foot, which the common Christianity obliges all to follow. Then follows his Challenge in these words, *shew me, saith he, any Heresie or Schism ever restored to the Church, without renouncing the same, and I will confess, that the Church it self turned Heretick or Schismatick from the same date.*

But here it may be objected, that the same Laws which obliges Persons to receive the Holy Sacrament as a Qualification for Offices, do oblige the Clergy to admit them to it. To which I answer, That as I have proved in the beginning of this Discourse, that Christ hath invested his Church with a Power to admit Persons into her Communion, and to exclude them from it, either in part or entirely; so the Constitution of our Kingdom doth reserve to the Church all those Rights which Christ hath given her, and thus *Magna Charta* begins, *We have granted unto God, and by this our present Charter have confirmed for us, and for our Heirs for ever, that the Church of England shall be free, and enjoy all Her Rights entire, and her Liberties inviolable; and it free in any thing, then certainly free in the exercise of those Spiritual Rights, with which its Officers are invested by a Divine Charter, free in the dispensing of those Mysteries of God whereof they are the only Stewards.* And it was with respect to this Greater

*Greater Charter*, that the late Lord Chief Justice *Hale* said of the Officers of the Church, *that they were the proper Judges appointed by Christ, to whom they themselves should apply Sacraments, or to whom they should deny them.* Indeed were not the Church free in the exercise of this Power; notwithstanding *Her Rights* stand upon a Divine Charter, and are secured by the Great Charter of the Kingdom, establish'd by its Laws, and confirm'd by the Oaths of our Kings and Queens at their Coronations, she would be less free in this respect, and in a worse Condition, than any of the *Tolerated Sects*. But as that Lord Chief Justice derived the Church's Right from Divine Institution, so he knew the Laws of the Land left her free in the exercise of it. Indeed what the Church is possess'd of by Divine Right, no Humane Laws can deprive her of; and if ever there should be such an attempt, 'tis certain, Christians must adhere to, and assert the Divine Institution, as it is certain, that *they must obey God, rather than Man*, but they must assert it by suffering, not with an armed Gospel, and acknowledge the Authority when they cannot obey the Law. Thus while we render to God the things that are God's, we shall render to *Cæsar* the things that are *Cæsar's*. Thus the Divine Institutions will be inviolably preserved to the end of the World, the Governments of the World never disturb'd by Religion, and God's Authority revered in Both.

But the Case before us stands in no need of this Defence; for I presume we may lay down this for a Truth, That our Legislators never intended those Persons should be admitted to the Lord's Table, as a Legal Qualification, who they never design'd should

K.

be.

Additional  
 Notes on the  
 Life and Death  
 of Sir Mat-  
 thew Hale,  
 p. 41.

See the Dialo-  
 gue between  
 Doctor and  
 Student.



be admitted to Offices ; and since they design'd by these Laws to exclude from the latter, all who were not Members of the Church, they never could intend such should be admitted to the former ; for they require all in Offices to receive the Sacrament according to the Usages of the Church of *England*, no otherwise than as it was a certain Test that they were Members of it. Suppose then not only a *Schismatick* or an *unconfirm'd Person*, but an unbaptised or an excommunicated Person ; a profess'd Socinian or Deist ; a notorious Sinners, or one that nourished Mortal hatred , should happen to obtain an Office, can we believe the Laws intended to oblige the Church to admit Persons under these Dispositions to be Partakers of the Blessed Eucharist. It would be an injury to the Legislators to imagine they ever design'd it. And therefore the Case seems to be very plain, that when the Laws require men to receive this Holy Sacrament to qualifie themselves for Offices ; they always suppose, that they must first qualifie themselves for the Holy Sacrament according to the Holy Laws of the Church, which are founded on those of the Gospel ; otherwise the Laws which require this Legal Qualification might be utterly defeated, and the receiving of the Sacrament would cease to be a Test, that the Persons who received it were Members of the Church.

But to make this yet plainer, if it may be, because the main hinge of this Controversie, with respect to the Laws, turns upon it. The end and design of the Corporation and Test Acts was the Preservation of the Constitution both in Church and State ; and in order to that, to place all Offices and Employments in the Hands of those Persons only who were Members of the Church ;

Church ; and that they might assure the Government they were truly so, it is required of all Persons in Office to make a Declaration, and receive the Holy Sacrament according to the Usages of the Church of *England*. This is the plain and undoubted intent and meaning of both these Acts of Parliament. And now can they who own themselves stated Members of an opposite Communion, demand admittance to the Sacrament as a Qualification for Offices by these Laws, which were enacted on purpose to exclude them ; and when the Laws require the receiving of the Sacrament no otherwise than as it is a Test or sacred Profession that they are truly Members of the Church : If these men can prevail with their own Consciences, to make this Profession when they are not so, can they believe these Laws oblige the Church to admit Schismatics to the Sacrament, and own those for her Members who are not, only that they may elude the Laws ? Could the Legislators who knew that by the Constitution of our Church Schismatics are not allow'd to approach the Lord's Table, ever be supposed to oblige the Clergy to violate *part* of the Constitution, that such Men might arrive at Power to destroy the *whole* ? And suppos'd to do this in those very Laws that they made to secure the Constitution, by excluding them from Power ? This is such an interpretation as would dissolve the Laws, nay turn them upon the Constitution, which by this Interpretation and Practice may be ruin'd by these very Laws that were made to preserve it.

I must therefore take the liberty to make an Observation on the following Paragraph in the aforesaid printed Speech, *There are other words in the Preamble,*  
*that*

Of the Bill a-  
gainst Occasi-  
onal Confor-  
mity.

*that do not appear to me to be well grounded. After the two Acts, the Corporation Act, and the Test Act are set forth, it is inferr'd, that it was intended that all men comprehended in them, should be, and always continue to be of the Communion of the Church of England. By the first of these Acts no Man could bear Office in a Corporation, unless he had received the Sacrament within a year before ; and by the other he who had a place of Trust, was to receive the Sacrament within three months after ; so by these Acts it is very true, that no Man might be in any employment who either had not been or was not then, in the Communion of the Church : But there is not a Clause, nor a word in either of these Acts that import, that he should always continue to be so.*

Now if this Author by these words, *in the Communion of the Church*, means the same that the Bill did, when it affirm'd it was intended that all Persons comprehended in those two Acts *should be of the Communion of the Church of England, i. e. Members of it* ; if this be his meaning, he grants as much as need be desired, for he saith, that by these Acts *no Man might be in any employment, who either had not been or was not then in the Communion of the Church*, which at once excludes all the Occasional Conformists from employments. Indeed to be *in the Communion of a Church* can signifie no less, for Communion always supposes Union ; and therefore to be *in or of the Communion of the Church*, is to be a Member of it ; but Occasional Conformists, who declare themselves stated Members of a separate Communion, can be no more Members of the Church in an Ecclesiastical sense, then a hand can be the hand of  
two



two different Bodies in a natural sense. Church-Communion or Church-Membership is a fix'd Relation, whereby, as every Member is entitled to the common Privileges of that Society, so is he obliged constantly to perform those common Duties, and Acts of Communion, which that Relation requires. But this Occasional Member (which is a constant Contradiction) who neither owns this Relation, nor those common Obligations; as he has no right to perform those Acts of Communion, so if against the Rules of the Catholick Church and our own, he doth Surreptitiously creep in among the Members of the Church, and doth what they do, yet since he doth it not as a Member of the Church, (a) it is no more an Act

(a) The Learned Bishop Stillingfleet saith, *Communion with a Church, is joining with a Church, as a Member of that Church, Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 107. and that the Occasional Communion is so far from looking like Communion, that it hath hardly the face of a Civility, p. 111. where there is much more to the same purpose. The same wild Notion of Communion is justly exploded by the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, Should any Man, saith he, who is no Member of the Church, nor owns himself to be so, intrude into the Church and Communicate in all Holy Offices, this can be no more called an Act of Communion, than it can be said to make him a Member of the Church, of which he is no Member, and resolved not to be Prayers receiving the Sacraments are Acts of Communion, when performed by Church-members in the Communion of the Church, but they are not Acts of Communion, when performed by those who are no Church-members, though to serve a turn, they thrust themselves into the Society of the Church.*

As for instance, Suppose a Member of a Presbyterian, or Independent Conventicle, should for reasons best known to himself, at some Critical time, come to his Parish Church, and there hear the Common-Prayer, and Sermon, and receive the Lord's Supper, according to the Order of the Church of England, does this make this Man a Member of the Church of England, with which he never communicated before, and it is likely will never do again, if it does not, all this is no Act of Communion, which can be only between the Members of the same Body.

So that to be in Church-Communion does not signifie meerly to perform such Acts, which are Acts of Communion in the Members of the Church, but since the decay of Church Discipline may sometimes be performed by those who are not Members, which is such an abuse as would not have been allowed in the Primitive Church, who denied their Communion to Schismatics, as well as to the excommunicate upon other accounts. The Resolution of some Cases, p. 12, &c. printed in the London Cases.

Of the Bill a-  
gainst Occasi-  
onal Confor-  
mity.

*that do not appear to me to be well grounded. After the two Acts, the Corporation Act, and the Test Act are set forth, it is inferr'd, that it was intended that all men comprehended in them, should be, and always continue to be of the Communion of the Church of England. By the first of these Acts no Man could bear Office in a Corporation, unless he had received the Sacrament within a year before ; and by the other he who had a place of Trust, was to receive the Sacrament within three months after ; so by these Acts it is very true, that no Man might be in any employment who either had not been or was not then, in the Communion of the Church : But there is not a Clause, nor a word in either of these Acts that import, that he should always continue to be so.*

Now if this Author by these words, *in the Communion of the Church*, means the same that the Bill did, when it affirm'd it was intended that all Persons comprehended in those two Acts *should be of the Communion of the Church of England, i. e. Members of it* ; if this be his meaning, he grants as much as need be desired, for he saith, that by these Acts *no Man might be in any employment, who either had not been or was not then in the Communion of the Church*, which at once excludes all the Occasional Conformists from employments. Indeed to *be in the Communion of a Church* can signifie no less, for Communion always supposes Union ; and therefore to *be in or of the Communion of the Church*, is to be a Member of it ; but Occasional Conformists, who declare themselves stated Members of a separate Communion, can be no more Members of the Church in an Ecclesiastical sense, then a hand can be the hand of  
two

two different Bodies in a natural sense. Church-Communion or Church-Membership is a fix'd Relation, whereby, as every Member is entitled to the common Privileges of that Society, so is he obliged constantly to perform those common Duties, and Acts of Communion, which that Relation requires. But this Occasional Member (which is a constant Contradiction) who neither owns this Relation, nor those common Obligations; as he has no right to perform those Acts of Communion, so if against the Rules of the Catholick Church and our own, he doth Surreptitiously creep in among the Members of the Church, and doth what they do, yet since he doth it not as a Member of the Church, (a) it is no more an Act

(a) The Learned Bishop Stillingfleet saith, *Communion with a Church, is joining with a Church, as a Member of that Church, Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 107. and that the Occasional Communion is so far from looking like Communion, that it hath hardly the face of a Civility, p. 111. where there is much more to the same purpose. The same wild Notion of Communion is justly exploded by the Reverend Dr. Sherlock, Should any Man, saith he, who is no Member of the Church, nor owns himself to be so, intrude into the Church and Communicate in all Holy Offices, this can be no more called an Act of Communion, than it can be said to make him a Member of the Church, of which he is no Member, and resolved not to be. Prayers receiving the Sacraments are Acts of Communion, when performed by Church-members in the Communion of the Church, but they are not Acts of Communion, when performed by those who are no Church-members, though to serve a turn, they thrust themselves into the Society of the Church.*

As for instance, Suppose a Member of a Presbyterian, or Independent Conventicle, should for reasons best known to himself, at some Critical time, come to his Parish Church, and there hear the Common-Prayer, and Sermon, and receive the Lord's Supper, according to the Order of the Church of England, does this make this Man a Member of the Church of England, with which he never communicated before, and it is likely will never do again, if it does not, all this is no Act of Communion, which can be only between the Members of the same Body.

So that to be in Church-Communion does not signifie meerly to perform such Acts, which are Acts of Communion in the Members of the Church, but since the decay of Church Discipline may sometimes be performed by those who are not Members, which is such an abuse as would not have been allowed in the Primitive Church, who denyed their Communion to Schismaticks, as well as to the excommunicate upon other accounts. The Resolution of some Cases, p. 12, &c. printed in the London Cases.



of Communion in him, than the foisting in a Vote at the Election of a Lord Mayor, would make him a Livery-man, who is none; or than such voting would be an Act of Communion with that Body, whereof he that gives it is no Member.

Since therefore this Author grants that by these Acts *no Man may be in any employment, who either had not been, or was not then in the Communion of the Church of England*; and since it is evident, no Occasional Conformists, whilst they are such, can ever be in that Communion, of which they are no Members; they are by this Author's Argument, utterly disabled from holding any Employment, and consequently those words at least in the Preamble of the Bill do appear to be well grounded, which affirm, that it was intended that all Men comprehended in these two Acts, should be of the Communion of the Church of England; and without enquiring whether they should always continue to be so. This alone is sufficient to exclude all Occasional Conformists from Employments, who as such never have been; and whilst they are no more than such, never can be of the Communion of the Church of England.

Whether indeed these Acts intended that all Men comprehended in them *should always continue to be of the same Communion*, is, I confess, another Question, though I think it can be none if, we may infer what was intended by the Legislators from the Occasion, the end and design of the Laws, which, for the very same reasons that they require those that are in Offices to be of that Communion, require them always to continue of it; unless we can suppose those Persons who desert the Principles and Communion of the Church, are likely to be as true Friends

Friends to it, and as proper to preserve it, as they who inviolably adhere to them. And therefore if any Clauses were doubtful, yet according to the known Rule we must avoid that sense, which defeats the ends of the Law; and take that sense which doth the work of it; that sense which may prevent the evils against which the Law was design'd, and attain the ends for which it was made. *Quotiens L. 67. Sect. de idem sermo duas sententias exprimit, ea potissimum Reg. Juris. excipiat, quæ rei gerendæ aptior est.*

But doth not the Act of Toleration make some alteration in this Case? The end for which the Toleration was granted, was that the Dissenters might have the free exercise of their Religion in their own way. This they entirely enjoy, and it is a very considerable ease and advantage, to all those whose Consciences will not give them leave to conform. But the *Occasional Conformists* who seem to have the least need of it, do however press it into their service: an Argument to serve for several purposes. Sometimes it is to free them from Schism; at other times it is to capacitate them for Offices; and then if they are not Schismatics, and are capable of Offices, why should they not be admitted to receive the Sacrament in our Churches as a Legal Qualification? It must be confess'd it serves all these Purposes equally, *i. e.* it serves none of them: and let him that doubts it, read over the *Toleration-Act*, and try whether he can find one Clause or word in it that provides for either.

*First*, The Act of *Toleration* doth not deliver them from the guilt of their Schism; because it only delivers them from those Penalties which the Laws of the Land inflicted on their Separation. But  
Schism:

Schism is a Breach of *God's Laws*, from their Obligation to which no *Law of Man* can discharge them; And therefore whilst the Toleration exempts them from the Penalties of Human Laws, it leaves the Schism as it found it, and the Dissenters to answer to God for it.

Nor, *Secondly*, Doth the Act of Toleration make the Dissenters capable of Offices, but leaves them in the same Condition, they were in before it was granted. If they stood excluded by the Corporation and Test Acts, they stand excluded still; before this Act of Indulgence, it was indeed Penal for their Ministers to preach and for them to hear. But now both are perfectly free to exercise their Religion; without any prejudice to their Persons, Liberties, or Estates. But it is one thing to be exempted from Penalties on the account of Religion, which is the purport of the Toleration; and another thing to be qualified for Offices, which that Act doth not meddle with. In short, the Act of Toleration doth no more make the Dissenters capable of Offices, and Employments in the State; than it gives their Ministers any Right to Benefices and Dignities in the Church.

And as it doth not make them capable of Places, so neither in the third place doth it give them any right to be admitted to the Sacrament as a Legal Qualification for them; the Toleration indeed leaves them at their Liberty, whether they will be Members of the Church or no; but it doth not in one tittle alter the Constitution of the Church, or oblige Her to admit to the Holy Communion against Her Rules, those Persons who are not Her Members, nor will be. What can be more absurd than to suppose the Toleration gives the Dissenters right to  
come



come to the Altars of the Church, when the only Reason for which it was granted them, was because they could not in Conscience come there ?

I know but one Objection more that may be made to this Discourse, which is, That if the Laws of the Land leave Ministers free, not to admit Occasional Conformists to the Lord's Table, and the Laws of the Church oblige them to refuse them, what need is there of the *Bill against Occasional Conformity* ? 'Tis true, if all Ministers would strictly adhere to the Rules of the Church in this matter, there would be less need of it ; but since some either mistake these Rules, or will not observe them, and Persons in Office are left to their Liberty to receive the Sacrament in any other Church as well as their own, they'll never fail of finding some to admit them to it ; and two or three such, are enough to serve all the Occasional Conformists of a whole County : whereby the Laws will be still evaded to the hazard of the Establishment, and therefore there is as great reason to enforce these Laws now, as there was at first to make them, so that unless we think the Constitution it self not worth preserving, we cannot think the Outworks of it, ought any longer to be slighted.

Nay, this Discourse is so far from making the *Bill* useless, that it gives to all the Orthodox Sons of the Church a *new* reason for it ; that Persons who by the Laws and Discipline of the Church ought to be refused, might not intrude themselves on the Ministers of Religion, and its Mysteries, under the cover of these Laws as they are at present abused ; and farther proves that the *abuse* which the Bill designs to prevent, with respect only to Offices, is what is *universally forbidden* by the Laws of the Catholick  
M Church,

Schism is a Breach of *God's Laws*, from their Obligation to which no *Law of Man* can discharge them; And therefore whilst the Toleration exempts them from the Penalties of Human Laws, it leaves the Schism as it found it, and the Dissenters to answer to God for it.

Nor, *Secondly*, Doth the Act of Toleration make the Dissenters capable of Offices, but leaves them in the same Condition, they were in before it was granted. If they stood excluded by the Corporation and Test Acts, they stand excluded still; before this Act of Indulgence, it was indeed Penal for their Ministers to preach and for them to hear. But now both are perfectly free to exercise their Religion; without any prejudice to their Persons, Liberties, or Estates. But it is one thing to be exempted from Penalties on the account of Religion, which is the purport of the Toleration; and another thing to be qualified for Offices, which that Act doth not meddle with. In short, the Act of Toleration doth no more make the Dissenters capable of Offices, and Employments in the State; than it gives their Ministers any Right to Benefices and Dignities in the Church.

And as it doth not make them capable of Places, so neither in the third place doth it give them any right to be admitted to the Sacrament as a Legal Qualification for them; the Toleration indeed leaves them at their Liberty, whether they will be Members of the Church or no; but it doth not in one tittle alter the Constitution of the Church, or oblige Her to admit to the Holy Communion against Her Rules, those Persons who are not Her Members, nor will be. What can be more absurd than to suppose the Toleration gives the Dissenters right to  
come

come to the Altars of the Church, when the only Reason for which it was granted them, was because they could not in Conscience come there ?

I know but one Objection more that may be made to this Discourse, which is, That if the Laws of the Land leave Ministers free, not to admit Occasional Conformists to the Lord's Table, and the Laws of the Church oblige them to refuse them, what need is there of the *Bill* against *Occasional Conformity* ? 'Tis true, if all Ministers would strictly adhere to the Rules of the Church in this matter, there would be less need of it ; but since some either mistake these Rules, or will not observe them, and Persons in Office are left to their Liberty to receive the Sacrament in any other Church as well as their own, they'll never fail of finding some to admit them to it ; and two or three such, are enough to serve all the Occasional Conformists of a whole County : whereby the Laws will be still evaded to the hazard of the Establishment, and therefore there is as great reason to enforce these Laws now, as there was at first to make them, so that unless we think the Constitution it self not worth preserving, we cannot think the Outworks of it, ought any longer to be slighted.

Nay, this Discourse is so far from making the *Bill* useless, that it gives to all the Orthodox Sons of the Church a *new* reason for it ; that Persons who by the Laws and Discipline of the Church ought to be refused, might not intrude themselves on the Ministers of Religion, and its Mysteries, under the cover of these Laws as they are at present abused ; and farther proves that the *abuse* which the Bill designs to prevent, with respect only to Offices, is what is *universally forbidden* by the Laws of the Catholick  
M Church,



Church, and of our own, for the Preservation of its Unity, and the Maintainance of its Discipline. And this alone is sufficient to justify the Zeal which the Clergy generally have express'd for the Bill. But when they consider the security of the Church too, depends so much upon it, they think even a greater degree of Zeal would want no Apology. And even to those Ministers who are for admitting Occasional Conformists, they think this Provision will be of some advantage; that it will by a happy necessity prevent them from being Parties, altogether innocently I cannot say, but I hope very undesignedly, to the Church's Ruine.

And with these Persons, if I might have leave, I would expostulate a little; and that I may do it with the greater Advantage, will suppose the most plausible reason that can be given for this Conduct, that they hope by it in time to unite the Occasional Conformists to the Church; but if it were warrantable, can it be thought a proper expedient to promote *Unity*, by breaking through those Laws which the Church has ever held necessary to preserve it? To trample under foot the Church's *Discipline*, to receive Men who make the want of it one pretence for their Separation? To admit Persons to the Communion against the Rules of the Church, who have made a *promiscuous Admission* one Objection against it? Is this a way to induce them to believe the Unity of the Church of so great moment, and *the rending of the glorious Body of Christ*, so great a Sin, when in the midst of their Separation they see themselves received to the Peace of the Church, and to the highest Act of its Communion?

On the other hand, when you thus break down  
the

the *Fences* of Ecclesiastical Communion, may you not justly fear some of your own Members may go out, at those Breaches you make to let these Men in? for will they believe you think there is any great Evil or Danger in Schism, when they see habitual Schismatics admitted at the Church's Altars, together with her most Obedient children? As if you thought it indifferent, whether they were in the Communion of the Successors of the Apostles, or of those who set up new Altars against them; whether they adhered to such Spiritual Usurers, or obey'd them that *have the Rule over them in the Lord*.

However, I would not be mistaken, as if Schismatics are to receive a rough or a peevish repulse. It ought to be introduced with such previous Admonitions, as may convince them of the great Sin and Danger of their way, how fatal it is to the Church's Peace, and to their own. Convince them that it is not out of pique to a Party, or prejudice to their Persons; but out of a just regard to the Unity, Laws, and Discipline of the Church; to your own indispensable Obligations to observe these; nay, to the safety of themselves, that you dare not, you cannot admit them: especially when they see you carry an impartial hand to other Offenders, where the Crime and notoriety of it will warrant the like procedure. This is true *Moderation* (since it is the word in fashion) that's consistent with Principles, and therefore always consistent with it self. That doth not give up one Principle of the Church, but maintains them all with Temper. That never makes Duty at odds with it self, or sets one Duty in opposition to another, but observes every Duty in its proper place; that whilst it exercises Charity towards Men's Persons, strictly keeps up the immutable Distinctions

ctions betwixt Truth and Falshood in things; betwixt Virtue and Vice, betwixt Good and Evil in Actions; without which Moderation, as they call it, is so far from being a Virtue, that it is a criminal Complaisance, against which the Prophet has denounced a *Wo*. And when the Ministers of Religion behave themselves with all that Authority and Firmness, which becomes those who act by a Divine Commission; and yet with that Gentleness and Meekness, that resembles him who gave it; and with that Tenderness and Compassion which is due to Souls in hazard of Eternal ruine; it will probably induce the Dissenters to make a stand, and take a review of their rash and ill chosen way, and render them attentive to the Church's Cause; which carries with it so great Evidence, that when it is managed with such steady Prudence, so bright a Zeal, and intense a Charity, it can hardly fail of Success: And oh what a Pleasure must spring up in his Mind, who *converts a Sinner from the error of his way, which shall hide a multitude of Sins*. It is worth a Man's coming into the World, to be an instrument in so happy a Work, as to *save a Soul from death*; infinitely worth it, on his own account too, because it gives himself the hopes of a brighter Crown, for *they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the Firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the Stars for ever and ever*.

*James 5. 20.*

*Dan. 12. 3.*

I'll close all with an Excellent Petition of our Liturgy.

*Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all Bishops, and Curates, that they may both by their Life and Doctrine, set forth thy true and lively Word, and rightly and duly Administer thy Holy Sacraments. Amen.*

FINIS.



